SCAAC Meeting Minutes
(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

January 25, 2000
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
1.	**Meeting Minutes**	**Benny Lile**
	A. Council Vacancies	**Scott Trimble**
	B. Legislative Update	**Scott Trimble**
2.	**Scholastic Audit**	**Tom Peterson**
3.	**District Accountability**	**Scott Trimble**
4.	**Interim Accountability**	**Scott Trimble**
5.	**Student Accountability**	**Scott Trimble**
6.	**Longitudinal Study Model 2**	**Scott Trimble**
7.	**School Report Card**	**Jay Roberts**
8.	**Work Place Readiness Issues**	**Rodney Kelly**
9.	**Standard Setting**	**Scott Trimble**
10.	**Released Form**	**Scott Trimble**
11.	**Studies**	**Scott Trimble**
Attachment A – Points about Student Accountability written by Robert Sexton		
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
January 25, 2000

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.
Chairman Benny Lile called the meeting to order. The roll was called.

Members Present:

Dale Campbell	Benny Lile	Sharon Whitworth
Kay Freeland	Roger Pankratz	John Stephens
Suzanne Guyer	Bob Sexton	Maynard Thomas
Maxie Johnson	Linda Sheffield	Bob Young

1. Meeting Minutes   Benny Lile

May 17, 1999 minutes approved
May 18, 1999 minutes approved
September 29, 1999 minutes approved with changes noted from the November
meeting.
November 30, 1999 – tabled until next meeting due to clarifications needed on page 3.

Pre-agenda items:

A. Council Vacancies   Scott Trimble

Recommendations for Council vacancies have been submitted to the Governor by Gene
Wilhoit to fill the vacant District Assessment Coordinator position.

B. Legislative Update   Scott Trimble

The department, as in the past, has a system of monitoring the Legislative Session.
Bonnie Brinly is the Department's Legislative Liaison and keeps us informed of
proposed Bills related to assessment and accountability. An elaborate review process is
in place for Bill reviews that enables us to react to bills that will be brought up in the
Senate or the House. Designated department staff sends bills to appropriate internal
staff for review. We are hoping for a relatively light session and so far, it appears to be
light.

Bills/Issues the Department is monitoring:

House Bill 178 – This House Bill would require the establishment of a mathematics assessment to predict or give students an understanding of their potential success in post-secondary mathematics classes.

HOUSE BILL 77 – Dropout Prevention Bill – After being amended, this bill would have an effect on the 2002 accountability decisions. It would require that schools have a 5% or less dropout rate before they could be considered for rewards. Our current regulation for the long-term accountability process requires 5.3% or less with leniency for schools having a dropout rate of 6% or less and have reduced their dropout rate by at least .5%.

There have not been any bills proposed yet, but one issue being discussed is the Site Based Decision Making Council (SBDM) authority for schools requiring an Scholastic Audit. The SBDM Council's authority could be limited.

HOUSE BILL 437 – Follow-up to HOUSE BILL 536 – This bill (102 pages long) addresses Professional Development, teaching, & support for teachers. It looks like an outstanding bill. It deals with a broad set of issues. It establishes a P-16 Council and establishes the Professional Standards Board as a separate agency that reports to the Governor. The bill has implications for more flexibility of salaries for teachers employed in at risk schools.

Overall budget for Education – The Governor's (initial) budget was presented to legislators. It includes funds to handle the standard setting process, provides for sufficient funds to carry on the longitudinal assessments over the next 2 years, and add funds for professional growth/training the department provides.

Based on historical practices, a joint committee will come together at end of the Legislative Session that will finalize the budget.

2. Scholastic Audit   **Tom Peterson**

There was a Public Hearing scheduled for the 21st of January. There were no comments made regarding the Scholastic Audit.

The Standards and Indicators for School Improvement Document is currently in about 580 schools. The purpose is to have schools that are performing high to look at the document and make comment on what contributes to their success. The results will be presented to Kentucky Board of Education.

The pilot and interim audit will be congruently conducted because of time. There have been a few changes. They came from various focus groups and are indicated in bold and underlined in the draft document.

One change was that language regarding the interim was taken out. We will have to present to Kentucky Board of Education how to meet statute requirements for 2000 in reference to the criteria for schools requiring scholastic audits. This most likely will be addressed through a policy established by the Board. This item was put on the Council agenda for further comment

SCAAC Comments:
The School Report Card should reflect a school being a part of an Scholastic Audit.

There may need to be some compensation for schools performing well and ask to have a scholastic audit. We don't need to ask them to get off task to help us. Their efforts need to be focused on continuing to do well.

If we are not careful we will be wrapped up in process and get away from instruction.

The proposed regulation language that states the make-up of an Scholastic Audit Team includes a parent that must have a child in school is a concern. A parent of a child that has already graduated should be allowed to serve.

3. District Accountability   **Scott Trimble**

The proposed regulation has not changed much at all since the last Council meeting. The only substantive change is the requirement that the results of the audit be shared with the Board immediately. This has been changed to a reasonable meeting date instead of the very next meeting date. This allows districts some flexibility.

The way the regulation is written right now districts that have all schools in progressing or above are defined as exemplary districts. The Kentucky Board of Education could consider additional recognition. The Board is thinking of additional public recognition. At this point in time there is no discussion of monetary rewards to districts.

There were no comments made on this regulation at the Jan 21st hearing.

SCAAC Request:
At the District Assessment Coordinator Advisory Committee Meeting, we were told there was an opinion being sought on the matter of rewards being used for school purposes. Please comment.

KDE Response:
Statute states that rewards shall be used for purposes of the school. The initial interpretation was that the rewards distributed to schools would be used for instructional purposes or for school improvements, not as teacher bonuses. There has been some debate on whether the language prevents teacher bonuses. The Attorney General is in the process of rendering an opinion. An Attorney General's Opinion doesn't have the force of law, but it helps us to understand how the language might be interpreted in a

court of law. The question remains open until we hear from the Attorney General's Office.

4.   Interim Accountability   **Scott Trimble**

We've modeled the interim accountability regulation using Kentucky Core Content Test data from the spring of 1999. We took the process to National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability at their December meeting. They agreed that we had implemented the model as they had suggested and we should proceed as outlined in the staff note prepared for the February 2000 meeting of the Kentucky Board of Education. They expressed a few minor concerns, but overall thought the model was fine and we should proceed.

In the beginning, we thought we might have one line of regression for all schools, but we found out the relationship between Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) and Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) data was slightly weaker at the elementary level than at the middle school and high school levels. So, we applied three different regression formulas. The formulas are given in the staff note. We combined formulas for P-8, 7-12, and P-12 schools.

Roughly 50% of schools would be eligible for rewards if we stopped the process right now. The formulas in the staff note and the number of schools in each category will be adjusted slightly when we add the 2000 data. The entire regression analysis will be redone after 2000 data are available. The formulas provided now are to help school staff understand the model.

On the chart provided, Prog Drop refers to schools that would receive rewards if their dropout rate were less than 8%.

We discourage the labeling or categorizing schools at this point in time. This information will change in 2000.

SCAAC Question:
What if you get a school that is content to have a high dropout rate, just so long as they are not considered in need of assistance?

KDE Response:
The new House Bills are trying to address high drop out rates. Once alerted to the problem, schools are not going to want to perpetuate the problem (high dropout rate). There are ethical practices already in other regulations and statutes. This is not the first time this has been discussed. It has been discussed since 1992. If a school acts this way, what is the appropriate response of the department? There are already sufficient standards of the profession. The Professional Standards Board would address this. There have been two solutions proposed: (1) the dropout rate could be increased in weight in the overall index. The only problem is that we would need to consider how

good data are and how much more effort can be given to collection. (2) A student data tracking system could be put in place to assign novices to the student who drop out and use this data in school indexes.

SCAAC Question:
What about home school versus dropout?

KDE Response:
The Federal definition recognizes the home school as a legitimate school and the student enrolled in a home school is not considered a dropout.

SCAAC Question:
What about students who are expelled, but who are provided services?

KDE Response:
In this case, the school is still held accountable for the student.

SCAAC Concerns:
Sometimes there are unanticipated consequences. For example, security cameras. Survey results in one of our schools showed a concern about smoking in restrooms. So we installed cameras and almost eliminated smoking. However, students old enough to smoke won't tolerate it and end up dropping out.

Regarding home school, I can see a situation where a student is going to be a dropout and a school suggests the student be a home school student.

KDE Comment:
There are a few ancillary issues you need to be aware of. There may be some high scoring schools that could be in the assistance category. There's a question of how the scholastic audit would be applied during interim. The intent of operation is that a scholastic audit would be conducted for the lowest scoring 1/3 of schools in assistance.

SCAAC Observations:
The Core Content Report is helpful, especially in arts & humanities and practical living/vocational studies. The way it's broken down is helpful. The report is very well done. The break down in open-response and multiple-choice is helpful. It helps us focus on areas we need to work on.

One may observe that in some cases, the percents of 3s and 4s are higher in a content area (say in Arts & Humanities) than in other content areas where the overall index is higher.

KDE Response:
We're giving the best information possible on a 0-4 scale. A mean on open-response questions do not correspond to National Association of Test Directors (NAPD).

Some data the department had collected on retentions between 3rd and 4th grade showed about 5000 students would be retained. The number was shocking.

KDE Response:
Not to defend or contest, but the data has to be questionable. When we tried to collect data early on, a number of schools refused to give the data, because it is not considered retention. The intent was not to highlight the number of years in Primary, but if to determine if students are ready to go on to 4th grade.

5. Student Accountability **Scott Trimble**

There have been 5 initiatives of student accountability discussed at Kentucky Board of Education. Some of them the Board did not consider being ways to hold all students accountable.

Two of the initiatives were related to gateway skills. The gateway skills would lead to curriculum intervention to help students perhaps through extended school activities (e.g., a longer school year or extended daily hours)

Another of the initiatives permitted, or perhaps required, teachers to score student responses according to locally defined criteria for the purpose of assigning students classroom grades based on how well they perform on the Kentucky Core Content Test. One initiative makes the Kentucky Core Content Test results part of the Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarship Funds (KEES).

The last initiative discussed was for the student results on the Kentucky Core Content Test to be put on student transcripts

Some Kentucky Board of Education members feel students would performance better if they had a stake in how well they did. A consensus is not apparent. National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability stated that it would take them 12-16 hours of committee time to discuss this. So, at their December meeting they ask us to prepare an initial paper that addresses student accountability. The paper will encompass the 5 initiatives, legal concerns, and research on student accountability. A draft of the paper will be circulated to NTAPAA for comment. This topic will be taken back to Kentucky Board of Education in March. The paper will be reviewed by the Council.

SCAAC Comments:
Research articles that have been reviewed by the Council and any position the Council has taken should be taken into consideration.

The paper by Richard Stiggins that Benny sent to all Council members reflects some connections with the points made about student accountability in the last meeting. (A

copy of the six points written by Bob Sexton is included in Attachment A to these minutes and are listed below.)

1. Ensure that it does not lower standards. It must maintain the same high standards already established within the Kentucky assessment system.
2. Ensure that the subjects tested have been taught.
3. Ensure that the remediation or extended school services are available to all students.
4. Ensure that students have qualified teachers in the subjects that are tested.
5. Ensure that inequities are not increased (scores show that African-American students and males do more poorly on Kentucky's assessment than other students.
6. Finally, the Council believes that, if changes to hold high school students accountable are made, and they disrupt the usefulness of high school assessments for school accountability, that an entirely new system of accountability for the high school level (as opposed to elementary and middle school level) be devised.

KDE Comment:
Another spin off of the gateway initiative is being able to distinguish between Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished and identify the steps in getting student to Proficient (to try to begin to develop a performance continuum). It's not really the same as student accountability, but it can help us get students to proficient. When the paper goes to the Kentucky Board of Education, it will be to help the Kentucky Board of Education understand the issues. The Kentucky Board of Education will have to agree that they want further action.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:
The P-16 initiatives need to be connected to these initiatives.

Could student accountability come out of the scholastic audit? Perhaps the scholastic audit could identify evidence of students not taking the test seriously even though opportunity has been given to students to learn through Extended School Services (ESS), motivational strategies, etc.

Looking at initiatives, the KEES scholarship and transcript only affect college bound students and may not accomplish what we want. There are ways to motivate students and we don't have the tools for a good assessment of these. That's an area we have to recognize. Intervention, longer school year, and longer days could be used in a positive way

The content background of teachers is important, as is teachers' ability to design good assessments. We have teachers that do not have the tools. It's a big issue. We need academies in assessment across the state.

We may not have enough teachers that can do this well. Time and money are issues.

Do we have ability to prepare student assessment to see how a student that's a novice in reading in 4th grade has done in the high school assessment?

Can we hold students accountable if we are not sure they are receiving what is needed to reach proficient?

Let's follow a student throughout all school. How much experience does a beginning teacher have in real world experiences to teach to real world? They've been sheltered.

Is there data from 92-98 that track students?

KDE Response:
We would need to build a database for data first and then address technical issues.

Later on in the agenda, we will discuss what type of data needs to be considered for data analysis needs.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:
Most people don't know how to interpret data. There's a lot more data there than most people know how to interpret. We thought we would have an assessment expert in each school. This didn't happen and we're lucky to have one in each district. We haven't given this area attention needed. It's one of the barriers we need to overcome in Kentucky.

Not sure all students are getting what they need to be held accountable. How do we determine these things are in place?

Is there sufficient evidence that kids are blowing the test off? It's almost instinctive that if you know the answer, you will put it down. Are they knowingly putting correct answers down?

If student accountability is part of the Scholastic Audit, then through a pilot of Scholastic Audit of successful schools we might learn what successful schools are doing.

High performing schools see this as an issue.

In some schools students will perform well for school spirit.

6. Longitudinal Study Model 2   **Scott Trimble**

An elementary pilot will be conducted this year. It is still in the Governor's budget. The plan is that this spring (May 9-11) we will retest all students in 158 schools who scored novice or apprentice in reading or mathematics on the spring 1999 Kentucky Core

Content Test. Two forms of the same reading test administered last year will be used. It will be scored against standards of the previous year (i.e., tests administered to 5th graders will be scored using 4th grade standards). Next year we hope to move to broaden to other grades. The Legislature's intent is for us to build this into the accountability system.

National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability recommended this model. Technical simplifications were considered.

We are going to return data to schools and schools may give to parents. Results will come back fall of 2000, after Sept 15th.

Testing could be required in 2001 for all students who were novice and low apprentice in 2000.

SCAAC Concerns/Questions:
Having to deal with all the other grades will be difficult right after the regular testing window. Logistics will be difficult.

Accountability issue – Will we reward schools having 5th grade students performing at the 4th grade level?

Instructional Issues – Time spent in remediation may be great. Will majority of a 6th grade students' day be spent on this?

Test security – Since we will use the same questions, will the questions be taught?

Student assessment versus school assessment – The whole program started out being a school assessment. Is student level data valid? We may be barely over the bar on individual validity.

7. School Report Card   **Jay Roberts**

The regulation that is beginning to take form includes the following sections:

    Section 1: Definitions
    Section 2: Definitions of data elements, sources and responsibilities
    Section 3: School Report Card Requirements (base card)
    Section 4: School Report Card Requirements (expanded)
    Section 5: District Report Card Requirements (base card)
    Section 6: Reporting Requirements; Timelines
    Section 7: Technology
    Section 8: Verification: Audits
    Section 9: Compliance: Consequences

The proposed regulation will go to Kentucky Board of Education in March for intent to promulgate. It will go for final decision in August.

One of the major concerns regarding the school report card was the teacher certification cells.

SCAAC Comments:
Some schools have not made available the extended report card for parents. It should have been available Jan 15th.

One thing that skews the data is that some schools have district wide programs (e.g., special education classes with a small number of students)

Make it clear when it is appropriate to clarify on the report card when a district pro-rates expenses.

8. Work Place Readiness Issues   Rodney Kelly

The 10th grade post-secondary readiness assessment did not get implemented through the last Request For Proposal (RFP) because we had not sufficiently defined what we wanted; an assessment certifying skills versus an assessment indicating instructional needs. Vendors' responses to the RFP were not acceptable in the opinion of the review process.

There were difficulties with the vendors being able to propose what was needed. There is continuing growth in the interest in this topic. Business, industry, education, and work force development are focused on the skills needed for the future work force of Kentucky. They are working on coming up with common skills needed and these skills need to link with assessment.

SCAAC Question:
Has anyone looked at the alignment of these skills with the Core Content?

KDE Response:
Not formally. We've just acknowledged that we should.

SCAAC Question:
If we determined that we wanted to move forward, what is the implication for bringing this into the assessment and accountability programs?

KDE Response:
If we're serious about doing something, then advisory committees or someone should make a clear statement of the purpose of the assessment for workforce readiness. Do students have the skills? What do we do about it if they don't? It's not reasonable to think we can go ahead without a change in legislation with regard to goals 3 & 4.

Defining limitations, what we can do within those limitations, and budget issues will have to be considered. Something of this magnitude cannot happen without an RFP. Some questions will have to be addressed. Questions such as: (1) should it be part of the accountability system or an information assessment process? And, (2) should it be targeted toward schools or individual students?

SCAAC Comment:
We need to look at what we do already, what we're not allowed to do, and then what should we do in light of this information.

The Council is seeking direction.

Are we doing this for the employers, schools, or students to know where they stand?

What's the primary goal? 10th grade?

KDE Response:
The purpose depends on if the assessment is going to be used for remediation or certification. We don't have to be restricted to 10th grade

There are some differences in what some people want assessed for occupational skills. Workplace and readiness type skills are needed by all.

In response to a question, the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) is a vocational assessment. Some of the skills on the ASVAB would be the ones considered for this assessment. ASVAB tries to find out what jobs you are most suited for based on an assessment of various aptitudes.

Through advisory panels in existence, Rodney will get more information on what needs to be assessed, what we already assess, and bring information back to the Council for further comment. He and staff will evaluate conflicts in desired measurement objectives and goals 3 & 4.

9. Standard Setting   **Scott Trimble**

We were pretty well engaged in Step 1 of the 6 steps of process. We wanted to build descriptors of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished in general, at the content area level, and at the content area grade level.

After Step 1, we did not have the grade level descriptors. National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability made it clear we needed to have these for the next steps (Bookmark, Jaeger-Mills, Contrasting Groups).

We met with 61 of the 90 teachers and took on the third product. We had our own staff sit down with the general descriptors and student work and draft some grade level descriptors on Jan 12 & 13. We mailed these out to teachers that met yesterday to review. Robyn Oatley presented feedback from public. Teachers reviewed work presented and made changes. The work will be formatted by Department staff and e-mailed to the teachers for review/comment.

The major audience for this work is teachers. The purpose is to allow a teacher to understand how well students have to perform to reach the proficient level of performance. It's for all teachers P-12 so that everyone has an understanding of what proficient is.

Beverly will get all the descriptors written so far to the Council for review and comment. We will put this on the next Council agenda for an update.

The writing group met and decided that no changes needed to be made in writing.

Jerry Lunney, OEA, comment: Jerry passed on a comment from a teacher participating in the standard setting work yesterday that arts & humanities and practical living/vocational studies should only be assessed at 12th grade.

10.   Released Form   **Scott Trimble**

There will be no released form for 2000. It's not possible because of the need to produce parallel forms of the test in each content area. We're going to have to stop releasing items so we can build up the item pool to build parallel forms. We do feel an obligation to provide materials to support teachers in the classroom. We're hoping to build a CD that will include annotated items, links between documents such as Program of Studies, Core Content, Academic Expectations, etc.

11.   Studies   **Scott Trimble**

Gender/Ethnicity - Doug Smith who is now at Western Kentucky University did this study

The study substantiates that there are gaps in performance; both gender and race. Students with Disabilities - Council members can look at study done on students with disabilities and get back to us with any comments they'd like to make.

Socio-Economics Status Indicators - Goals 2000, federal regulations, etc. are pressing pretty hard for disaggregation on SES data. Our proxy is free/reduced lunch. This is problematic at the middle school and high school levels. The quality of data is questionable when collected on the student response booklets. We're seeing discrepancies between data collected on the assessment and data collected by the

Division of School Lunch. This is a reporting issue that needs to be dealt with in the near future.

SCAAC Question:
Why can't we use elementary reported data and not from the test booklet?

KDE Response:
We can and do use the data. We can do correlations, but we can't show the performance of students of free and reduced lunch without using the data collected on the student response booklet.

What we found out is that when we compare free and reduced lunch test data with school lunch data, data is different sometimes by as much as 20 to 25%.

SCAAC Comment:
This is an important item and needs more attention. Put this topic on the agenda for the next Council meeting.

Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned.

Attachment A

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES
REGARDING
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT ACCOUNTABILITY
Background

- Since Kentucky implemented its accountability system in the early 1990s most states have also put accountability programs in place, but most of these programs are based on holding individual students accountable for their performance (e.g., denying promotion or graduating) as opposed to the school-based system that Kentucky adopted.
- As time passes these systems in other states have become controversial and resulted in multiple lawsuits that will be decided by the courts over the next few years.

- There is confusion about the term "student accountability" but as we see it, the term applies to high school students and not students in earlier grades.

<u>Statement of Principles</u>

If testing for high school level students is to have consequences for students, it should:
1. Ensure that it does not lower standards. It must maintain the same high standards already established within the Kentucky assessment system.
2. Ensure that the subjects tested have been taught.
3. Ensure that remediation or extended school services are available to all students.
4. Ensure that students have qualified teachers in the subjects that are tested.
5. Ensure that inequities are not increased (scores show that African-American students and males do more poorly on Kentucky's assessment than other students.)
6. Finally, the Council believes that, if changes to hold high school students accountable are made, and they disrupt the usefulness of high school assessments for school accountability, that an entirely new system of accountability for the high school level (as opposed to elementary and middle school level) be devised.